

REMARKS

Basis for the insertion of photographic film into claim 1 may be found at page 7 line 6 of the specification. Basis for new claim 15 may be found at page 10 line 5 of the specification. Basis for new claims 16, 17, and 18 may be found in original claims 10, 6, and 7 respectively.

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1 and 7-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 112 second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner requests that "improved" in claim 1 be deleted. The Examiner suggests that claim 7 should be dependent upon 6, and that claims 8 and 9 do not have sufficient antecedent basis for the resins referred to. Each of these objections has been overcome by the amendments to the claims as set forth above. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 USC 112 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Czuprynski et al. (048). The Examiner states that Czuprynski discloses a device having substantially all the claim features but does not disclose the wear rate coefficient. The Examiner states that the wear rate would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art since the to-strive-for wear rate is zero. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As set forth in the background of the instant specification, wear rate was not known to be an important issue in this art. As set forth there prior cores had an extremely long life and generally were not considered to wear out. One of ordinary skill in the art did not have any knowledge of wear rate as to one of skill in the art it was not a problem. Further, it was not known if wear of the core caused debris in the film. It was considered that other parts of the process, such as punching holes in the film, were the causes of debris. Prior to the instant invention, no one knew that core wear added to debris in the film and further until the recent high speed of winding generated significant debris it was not an issue. In this invention the realization of core wear debris as a problem created the need for the invention and was unexpected and not obvious. Once the inventors surprisingly discovered the core was a cause of debris, then the formation of a core with a high wear resistant material was carried out. The Examiner states that it is obvious to strive for zero wear. However, unless there is

a problem with wear this is not done. Ordinarily cores are selected to be the cheapest possible that will perform in a satisfactory manner. There is no reason to have a zero wear rate unless it is known that wear is a problem. In the instant invention wear was not known to be a problem and therefore a solution was not obvious. It is respectfully requested that the rejection over Czuprynski be reconsidered and withdrawn as there is nothing in Czuprynski to lead one to the invention.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over applicants admitted prior art. Applicants admitted prior art includes the discussion on pages 1-2 of the specification disclosing cores made of HIPS resin. Pages 7-12 are stated to disclose commercially available resins. The Examiner states it would be obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to make prior art core with the commercially available resins to obtain the advantages of these commercially available resins. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The prior art discussion is a disclosure of the prior art cores and that the applicant found these cores to be a problem when high speed manufacturing was carried out. There is no disclosure that others were aware of the problem prior to the instant invention. Without any knowledge of the problem there would be no incentive for the invention and it would not be obvious. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections under 35 USC 112 and 35 USC 103 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that an early Notice of Allowance be issued in this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,664

Paul A. Leipold/rgd
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-722-5023
Facsimile: 585-477-1148